



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/881,104	06/15/2001	Kiril A. Pandelisev	PHOENIX SCIENTIFIC	7265

7590 01/15/2003

James C. Wray  
Suite 300  
1493 Chain Bridge Road  
McLean, VA 22101

EXAMINER

GAGLIARDI, ALBERT J

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2878

DATE MAILED: 01/15/2003

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/881,104

Applicant(s)

PANDELISEV, KIRIL A.

Examiner

Albert J. Gagliardi

Art Unit

2878

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 September 2002.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-132 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 9, 13, 14, 16-22, 33, 42, 46, 47, 49-54 and 64 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-8, 10-12, 15, 23-32, 34-41, 43-45, 48, 55-63, 65 and 66 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 15 June 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
- If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
- a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

## Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) 2.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other:

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restrictions*

1. Applicant's election with traverse of Species 1 in Paper No. 4 (claims 1-66) is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that the claims of Species 1-7 do not relate to materially different apparatus, products or processes; that the inventions are not independent or distinct; and that, even if the inventions are independent and distinct, the examiner has not shown that there is a serious burden on the examiner and therefore all claims should be examined. This is not found persuasive.

Regarding applicant's argument that the species are not related to materially different apparatuses, products, or processes, the examiner notes that no restriction between inventions related as apparatus, products, or processes has been made (i.e., the species are identified as "relating to . . . apparatus and methods . . ." with no separate requirement for restriction between the apparatus and method claims which may be directed to any particular species.

As to the restriction requirement between species, the primary criteria for restricting claims to species is that they have mutually exclusive characteristics (which has not been argued by applicant), and that they be patentably distinct (See MPEP 806.04(f) and 806.04(h)).

As noted in the previous office action, if applicant traverses on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record which shows the species to be obvious variants of each other or clearly admit on the record that such is the case. Applicant has not submitted or identified any such evidence, nor clearly admitted on the record that the claims are not patentably distinct (an argument that the species are not "materially different" falls well short of an admission that the species are not

Art Unit: 2878

“patentably distinct”). Absent such evidence or admissions, the requirement for restriction between species is considered proper and is maintained.

Regarding applicant’s argument that the inventions are not independent and distinct, the examiner notes that while some of the claimed species may be both a species under a claimed genus and related (i.e., as subcombinations usable together in a multifunctional combination, or as combination and subcombination), the requirement for restriction has been determined on the basis of both the practice applicable to species and the practices applicable to related inventions (See MPEP 806.04 (b)). Since the restriction is proper under both criteria, the inventions are considered independent and distinct, and the requirement for restriction between species is considered proper and is maintained.

Regarding applicant’s argument that there is not a serious burden on the examiner to examine all 132 claims, including 14 independent claims the examiner respectfully disagrees.

Under 37 CFR 1.141, two or more independent and distinct inventions may not be claimed in one national application except that more than one species of an invention, not to exceed a reasonable number, may be claimed when the application also includes an allowable claim generic to all the claimed species and all the claims to species in excess of one are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitation of the generic claim. Since applicant has not yet met the criteria under 37 CFR 1.141, the burden on the examiner is *prima facie* satisfied.

The examiner further notes that, even though such requirement is unnecessary since the restriction is being required on the basis of MPEP 806.04 and 37 CFR 1.141, the examiner has also met his burden under MPEP 806.05 because, as noted in the previous office action, the

Art Unit: 2878

distinct inventions have acquired a separate status in the art, which may be shown by a separate field of search (See MPEP 808.02 (B) and MPEP 808.02 (C)). In the previous office action, the examiner has established that the distinct inventions require a separate field of search based on their recognized divergent subject matter (i.e., spectroscopy, dosimetry, remote viewing and endoscopy, and medical imaging). Although those skilled in the art would generally recognize that such subjects inherently require a different field of search, some particular examples include: for species/subcombination 1, a separate field of search in spectrometry related areas including subclasses directed to the use of plural or composite luminophores such as class/subclass 250/367; for species/subcombination 2, a separate field of search in areas related to dosimetry such as class/subclass 250/484.5; for species/subcombination 3, a separate field of search in areas related to remote viewing and endoscopy such as class/subclass 250/341.2; for species/subcombination 4, a separate field of search in areas related to medical imaging such as class/subclass 250/363.02. The examiner notes that the above examples are merely exemplary and that a complete search for each invention would also require a unique text based search related to the pertinent subject matter.

The requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

2. Claims 67-132 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected species, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in Paper No. 4.

Claims 9, 13-14, 16-22, 33, 42, 46-47, 49-54 and 64 are additionally withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner as being drawn to a nonelected species. The examiner notes that while applicant has indicated that claims 1-66 read on the elected species (Species 1),

Art Unit: 2878

drawn to scintillator apparatus and methods utilizing plural scintillator bodies and a holder (as suggested according to Fig. 5), it is considered that claims 9, 13-14, 16-22, 33, 42, 46-47, 49-54 and 64 do not, in fact, read on the elected species and, therefore, have not been considered.

***Information Disclosure Statement***

3. The information disclosure statement filed October 5, 2001 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

4. Where the IDS citations are submitted but not described, the examiner is only responsible for cursorily reviewing the references. The initials of the examiner on the PTO-1449 indicate only that degree of review unless the reference is either applied against the claims, or discussed by the examiner as pertinent art of interest, in a subsequent office action. See Guidelines for Reexamination of Cases in View of *In re Portola Packaging, Inc.*, 110 F.3d 786, 42 USPQ2d 1295 (Fed. Cir. 1997), 64 FR at 15347, 1223 Off. Gaz. Pat. Office at 125 (response to comment 6). Consideration by the examiner of the information submitted in an IDS means that the examiner will consider the documents in the same manner as other documents in Office search files are considered by the examiner while conducting a search of the prior art in a proper field of search. The initials of the examiner placed adjacent to the citations on the PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08A and 08B or its equivalent mean that the information has been considered by the examiner to the extent noted above. MPEP § 609 (Eighth Edition, August 2001).

Art Unit: 2878

The examiner notes that due to the unusually large number of references cited, and the absence of any description of the relevance of the references, it should be assumed that only the most cursory review of the cited documents consistent with these guidelines has been performed. If applicant is aware of any information that might be of particular relevance, it should be pointed out in order to insure a higher degree consideration.

***Drawings***

5. The drawings are objected to because they contain numerous spelling and typographical errors. Some particular errors include:

In Fig. 6, the explanatory note recites “ microlense tupe array”.

In Fig. 12, “Fiber optica”.

In Fig. 15, “view of afiber”.

A proposed drawing correction or corrected drawings are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

6. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 3-4, 7-8, and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding claim 3, the limitation “that the fibers are “sufficiently long for controlling dark current related problems” is indefinite. The examiner notes that the neither the length of the

Art Unit: 2878

optical fibers that is sufficient nor the types of dark current related problems that could be controlled are defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. The examiner also notes that the term "controlled" is also indefinite since the term is likewise not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. The length of the optical fibers used in the device is rendered indefinite.

Regarding claim 4, the limitation that the "scintillator is configured for use far below an earth surface" is indefinite. The examiner notes that it is unclear what, if any, limitations are imposed on the scintillator such that it is configured for use far below an earth surface. The examiner further notes that the term "far" is a relative term which also renders the claim indefinite. The term "far" is not defined by the claim, the specification does not provide a standard for ascertaining the requisite degree, and one of ordinary skill in the art would not be reasonably apprised of the scope of the invention. The configuration of the scintillator is rendered indefinite.

Regarding claim 7, the claim recites the limitation "the second output" in line 5. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The examiner notes that since there is no necessary antecedent basis for a second output, the limitation probably should be "a second output".

Regarding claim 8, the claim recites the limitation "the first and second output" in lines 1-2. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The examiner notes

Art Unit: 2878

that the limitation of a second output first occurs in claim 7, which is not a part of the chain of dependency.

Method claims 36-37 are indefinite for the same reasons as discussed in related apparatus claims 3-4.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

7. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

8. Claims 1-4, 23, 34-37, and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Reed (US 5,313,065) Bourdinaud *et al.* (US 5,103,099).

Regarding claim 1, *Reed* discloses a fiber optic enhanced scintillator apparatus (Figs. 1-4) comprising a scintillator body (20), surfaces on the body for directing photons toward a photon output (45); single or multiple optical fibers (40) with proximal ends connected to the photon output (45).

Regarding claim 2, *Reed* discloses a photon detector (15) connected to the distal end.

Regarding claim 3, as best understood, *Reed* discloses that the optical fibers may be long (see generally Fig. 1). As best understood, an inherent aspect of such long fibers is that they control dark current related problems.

Regarding claim 4, as best understood, in the apparatus disclosed by *Reed*, the scintillator is configured for use far below an earth surface (inherent in view of its location) wherein the

Art Unit: 2878

optical fibers extend from the scintillator far below the earth's surface to the detector mounted above the earth's surface (see generally Fig. 1; col. 1, lines 40-55).

Regarding claim 23, *Reed* discloses that the scintillator body (20) may comprise plural scintillator bodies (i.e., plural channels) incorporated into a single holder (30) for holding the plural bodies in an array (col. 2, lines 59-62), and wherein the single or multiple optical fibers (40) have proximal ends connected to the plural scintillator bodies (inherent).

Regarding claims 34-37, the apparatus disclosed by *Reed*, as applied to claims 1-4 above, suggests a fiber optic enhanced scintillator method comprising providing a scintillator body with surfaces for directing photons toward an output, providing single or multiple optical fibers; connecting the optical fibers to the output; producing photons upon a scintillator being energized by a subatomic particles, energy, or rays; connecting a photon detector to the optical fibers; providing optical fibers that are long; configuring the scintillator for use far below an earth's surface, mounting the detector on the earth's surface; extending the fibers from the scintillator to the photon detector; and transmitting photons to the detector.

Regarding claim 55, the apparatus disclosed by *Reed*, as applied to claim 23 above, suggests a method further comprising providing individual scintillator bodies and holder; holding the plural bodies in an array, and connecting optical fibers to each of the plural bodies.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

9. Claims 5-6, 10-12, 24, 38-39, 43-45, 56 and 65-66 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Reed*.

Regarding claims 5 and 6, although not specifically disclosed by *Reed*, the use of optical couplings, including micro lenses, are well known. Those skilled in the art appreciate that such

Art Unit: 2878

couplings can allow easier coupling of optical components as well as improved signal transmission. Therefore, depending on the needs of the particular application, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus to further include an optical coupling, including a micro lens and/or micro lens array, between the scintillator body and the output to allow for easier coupling of the components and improved signal transmission.

Regarding claims 10, 11 and 12, although *Reed* does not specifically disclosed the use of an electronic cooler, magnetic shielding, or electromagnetic shielding connected to the detector, those skilled in the art appreciate that the use of such coolers and shielding are well known for use in improving detector sensitivity and reducing unwanted signal noise. Therefore, depending on the needs of the particular application, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus to further include an electronic cooler and shielding to allow for improved detector sensitivity and reduced signal noise.

Regarding claim 24, although *Reed* does not specifically suggest the use of plural micro lenses connected to the plural scintillator bodies for coupling photons from the plural scintillator bodies to the proximal ends of the optical ends of the optical fibers, the use of micro lenses are well known (see explanation regarding claim 5 above) and would have been an obvious design choice.

Regarding claims 38-39, the apparatus suggested *Reed*, as applied to claims 5-6 above, suggests a method comprising providing an optical coupler; an array of micro lenses on the coupler; and directing photons through the micro lenses to the optical fibers.

Art Unit: 2878

Regarding claims 43-45, the apparatus suggested *Reed*, as applied to claims 10-12 above, suggests a method further comprising providing an electronic cooler, magnetic shielding, and electromagnetic shielding.

Regarding claim 56, the apparatus suggested *Reed*, as applied to claim 24 above, suggests a method further comprising plural micro lens arrays; and directing photons from the scintillators through the micro lens arrays to the optical fibers.

Regarding claims 65-66, the apparatus disclosed by *Reed*, as applied to claims 35 and 43 above, suggests a method further comprising connecting a detector to the optical fibers and cooling the detector with an electronic cooler.

10. Claims 7, 8, 28-32, 40-41, and 59-63 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Reed* as applied above, and further in view of Bourdinaud *et al.* (US 5,103,099).

Regarding claim 7, as best understood, *Reed* does not specifically disclose the use of multiple outputs and multiple optical couplings and micro lens arrays for each scintillator body.

Regarding the use of multiple outputs and optical couplings and micro lens arrays for each scintillator body, *Bourdinaud* discloses a fiber optic enhanced scintillator apparatus wherein a single scintillator body (8) may in functionally equivalent alternative arrangements include a one or more sets of optical fibers (4, 46) optically coupled to the scintillator body (compare Figs. 1 and 4). Therefore, absent some degree of criticality, it would have been an obvious design choice within the skill of a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus suggested by *Reed* to further include the use of a second optical coupler connected to the scintillator body in view of the known functionally equivalent arrangements suggested by *Reed*.

Regarding claim 8, as best understood, *Reed* discloses that optical fibers may be connected to a single detector (15).

Regarding claim 28, in the apparatus suggested by *Reed*, as applied to claim 23 above, *Reed* does not specifically disclose that the optical couplers are located on the sides of the plural scintillator bodies. Regarding providing the optical couplers on sides of the scintillator body, it is well known to position the coupling arrangement in any of a variety of functionally equivalent locations (see for example *Bourdinaud* (Fig. 1) wherein the optical coupling is provided on the side of the scintillator) depending on the needs of the particular application. Therefore, absent some degree of criticality, providing the optical coupling on the side of the scintillator would have been an obvious design choice depending on the needs of the application in view of the known suitability of such locations for the purpose of optical coupling.

Regarding claim 29, *Reed* discloses that the choice of the particular cross-section of the scintillator bodies depends on the needs of the particular application (col. 2, lines 63-65). Those skilled in the art appreciate that a wide variety of cross-sectional shapes, particularly round, square and rectangular, are well known and, absent some degree of criticality, would have been an matter of routine design choice depending on the needs of the particular application.

Regarding claim 30, in the apparatus suggested by *Reed* and *Bourdinaud* (see explanation regarding claims 23 and 28 above), *Reed* suggests that the plurality of scintillators are independent scintillators wherein the independent scintillators are angularly related (apparently a 0 ° angle) to an axial direction of the holder (30) and where the proximal ends of the optical fibers are connected to lateral edges of the scintillator bodies (functionally equivalent suggestion of *Bourdinaud*).

Note: While the examiner considers “angularly related” to include angles of zero degrees, the examiner notes that at least one non-elected species not particularly identified by the examiner (see Fig. 8, for example) includes scintillators at axial angles other than zero degrees. While not necessarily considered as a limitation of this claim, the examiner notes, however, that it is known in the art to overlap (shingle) detector arrays (see for example Oka *et al.* -- US 4,755,681 -- at Fig. 1B) in order to improve detection efficiency and avoid dead areas.

Regarding claim 31, absent some degree of criticality, the particular cross-sectional shaped of the scintillator body would have been a matter of routine design choice depending on the needs of the particular application (see explanation regarding claim 29 above).

Regarding claim 32, in the apparatus suggested by *Reed* and *Bourdinaud* (see explanation regarding claims 23 and 7 above), *Bourdinaud* discloses that the optical fibers may include first and second groups of optical fibers connected on opposite side edges of the scintillator bodies (see generally Fig. 4).

Regarding claims 40-41, the apparatus suggested *Reed* and *Bourdinaud*, as applied to claims 7-8 above, suggests a method further comprising providing a second optical coupler and a second photon output on the scintillator body; a second array of micro lenses; directing photons from the second part of the scintillator body to the second output; providing second optical fibers connected to the second output; and connecting the first and second optical fibers to a single detector.

Regarding claims 59-60, the apparatus suggested *Reed* and *Bourdinaud*, as applied to claims 28-29 above, suggests a method further comprising providing optical couplings on sides

Art Unit: 2878

of the plural scintillator bodies; and coupling the sides of the scintillator bodies to the optical fiber; wherein the plural scintillator bodies may have square, round, or other cross-sections.

Regarding claims 61-63, the apparatus suggested *Reed* and *Bourdinaud*, as applied to claims 30-32 above, suggests a method further comprising providing a plurality of independent scintillators, angularly arranged to each other; connecting the optical fibers to the lateral edges of the scintillator bodies; wherein the scintillator bodies may have a square or round cross-section; providing optical connectors at opposite side edges of the scintillator bodies; and connecting the optical fibers to the opposite side edges

11. Claims 15 and 48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Reed* and *Bourdinaud*, and further in view of *Meisner et al.* (US 4,904,865).

Regarding claim 15, *Reed* and *Bourdinaud* (see explanation regarding claim 7 above) suggest the apparatus including a second output and first and second optical couplers. *Reed* and *Bourdinaud* do not specifically suggest that the coupler bodies are elastomeric. Regarding the use of an elastomeric coupling, *Meisner* discloses (Fig. 4) a scintillator apparatus for use in below ground applications including a scintillator body (160) and an elastomeric optical coupler (164) which additionally functions as a shock absorber (col. 6, lines 26-27). Therefore it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to modify the apparatus suggested by *Reed* and *Bourdinaud* so as to utilize elastomeric couplings in order to reduce the potential for damage caused by shock.

Regarding claim 48, the apparatus suggested *Reed*, *Bourdinaud* and *Meisner*, as applied to claim 15 above, suggests a method further comprising providing elastomeric optical coupler bodies to cushion the scintillators; and delivering photons from the scintillator body outputs.

Art Unit: 2878

12. Claims 25-27 and 57-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Reed* as applied above, and further in view of *Kaufman et al.* (US 2002/00870079 A1).

Regarding claims 25 and 26, although *Reed* does not specifically disclose that the holder is flexible and resilient, *Reed* does disclose that the design of the probe body can be tailored to the particular monitoring scenario. Resilient and flexible holders are well known. *Kaufman*, for example, discloses (Fig. 1) a scintillation detector including a plurality of scintillation bodies (28) housed in a flexible and resilient holder (22). *Kaufman* teaches that such an arrangement allows for flexibility and easier introduction of the detector to the desired location (pars. 31, 35). Therefore, depending on the needs of the particular application, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to utilize a holder that is flexible and resilient so as to allow for easier introduction of the of the detector at the desired location.

Regarding claim 27, in the apparatus suggested by *Reed* and *Kaufman* (see explanation regarding claims 25-26 above), the holder is elongated and flexible and the plural scintillator bodies are arranged axially in the holder.

Regarding claims 57-58, the apparatus suggested *Reed*, *Bourdinaud* and *Kaufman* as applied to claims 25-27 above, suggests a method further comprising providing a flexible, resilient, and elongated holder wherein the scintillator bodies are arranged axially.

### ***Conclusion***

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Art Unit: 2878

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Albert J. Gagliardi whose telephone number is (703) 305-0417.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday thru Friday from 9 AM to 5 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David P. Porta can be reached on (703) 308-4852. The fax phone numbers for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned are (703) 872-9318 for regular communications and (703) 872-9319 for After Final communications.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.



Albert J. Gagliardi  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2878

AJG  
January 9, 2003